



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/535,790	03/29/2000	Deirdre O'Shea	99-032	7017

22927 7590 09/03/2003

WALKER DIGITAL
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER

YOUNG, JOHN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/535,790

Applicant(s)
O'Shea et al.

Examiner
John Young

Art Unit
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John Young

(3) _____

(2) Mike Downs

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 2, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Christensen & Kanter

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner confirmed that all claims 1-167 are pending; however only 1-74, 87, 94-95, 144-153 & 162-167 are elected at this time and subject to examination. Discussed 101 rejection, i.e., not within the technological art no system compoments mentioned, i.e., claim 1. Office Action (paper#9) prematurely concludes that official notice was not seasonably challenged; therefore, the statement that Official Notice evidence is admitted is withdrawn and a reference concerning the claims at issue will be provided in the next Office Action. And discussed 103 rejection of claim 1 as to whether Christensen and Kanter references suggests all elements and limitations. The examiner pointed to Christenson fig 14 as well as Kanter as showing benefit variation and variation condition respectively. Also, Examiner pointed out that the breadth of the claim language gave way to broad interpretation of what the claim could read on.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 9-2-03
Examiner's signature, if required